DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 31 – 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Faroudja (US Patent Number 5,151,783) in view of Yamashita et al. (US Patent Number 6,747,693, hereinafter "Yamashita").

3. As per claims 31, 36 and 41, Faroudja teaches a method, device and medium comprising: receiving video into a video display device (television system, column 3, lines 44 – 51); placing the device in one of a storage mode mad an image processing mode, wherein: the storage mode (storage mode stores into magnetic recording medium, column 3, lines 45 – 51 and shown as done by processor in column 6, lines 37 – 46) is a mode in which the video is to be stored in a memory of the device and/or to be retrieved from the memory for display on a video display of the device (86, figure 3b), placing the device in the storage mode includes downloading microcode into at least one programmable processor (detail processor 38, figure 3a) in response to the input from the user to cause the at least one programmable processor to store the video into the memory (detecting carrier modulation is the determining of the mode, column 4,

lines 3 – 15); the image processing mode (image processing by image detail processor 38, column 7, lines 22 – 32) is a mode in which the video is not to be stored in the memory and/or the video is not to be displayed on the video display from the memory; placing the device in the image processing mode includes downloading microcode into the at least one programmable processor to cause the at least one programmable processor to perform enhanced image processing on the video (9, figure 3, forwarded to image processing 10).

Faroudja does not explicitly disclose the user input.

Yamashita teaches a device to be placed in a storage mode in response to an input from a user of the device to pause or rewind a video displayed on the video display, or to save the video (via detector 24, figure 12).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify Faroudja with the above teachings for Yamashita. One of ordinary skill would be motivated to make such modification in order to enhance image processing (column 1, lines 51 - 59).

4. Faroudja modified by the teachings of Yamashita as seen in claim 31 above, as per claims 32, 37 and 42, Faroudja teaches a method, device and machine-readable medium further comprising compressing (compression takes place at 42, figure 3a, which is before storing which occurs at path 12, figure 3b), using the at least one programmable processor, the video prior to storing the video into the memory when the

device is in the storage mode.

5. Faroudja modified by the teachings of Yamashita as seen in claim 31 above, as per claims 33, 38 and 43, Faroudja teaches a method, device and machine-readable medium wherein performing enhanced image processing on the video comprises performing a reduction of at least one of ghosting, noise and dot-crawl of the video (noise reduction 70, figure 3b, column 8, lines 38 – 58, ghost reduction column 5, lines 55 – 67).

6. Faroudja modified by the teachings of Yamashita as seen in claim 31 above, as per claims 34, 39 and 44, Faroudja teaches a method, device and machine-readable medium wherein performing enhanced image processing on the video with the at least one programmable processor comprises performing a first enhanced image processing operation on the video, wherein the first enhanced image processing includes reduction of one of ghosting, noise, and dot-crawl of the video, and performing a second enhanced image processing operation is different from the first enhanced image processing operation and includes reduction of one of ghosting, noise, and dot-crawl of the video (frame reduction known, column 1, lines 34 – 37, and performing in the modification of the recurrent picture frame rate, column 3, lines 52 – 63).

7. Faroudja modified by the teachings of Yamashita as seen in claim 31 above, as per claims 33, 38 and 43, Faroudja teaches a method, device and machine-readable

medium wherein performing enhanced image processing on the video with the at least one programmable processor further includes performing a third enhanced image processing operation on the video, the third enhanced image processing operation being different from the first and second enhanced image processing operations and including reduction of one of ghosting, noise, and dot-crawl of the video (ghost reduction column 5, lines 55 – 67).

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 31 – 45 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to AURANGZEB HASSAN whose telephone number is (571)272-8625. The examiner can normally be reached on 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on 571-272-6729. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

AH

/Ilwoo Park/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2182
10/12/2011